



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,997	11/03/2003	Mark Levine	930009-2015	5362
20/999 7590 06/12/2008 FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151				
EXAMINER				
PIZIALI, ANDREW T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,997

Applicant(s)

LEVINE ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew T. Piziali

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22-34 and 36-40 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 5, 6, 25 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22-24, 27-34 and 36-40 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-848)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 4/25/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-4, 7-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification discloses that the current invention may be drawn to a fabric used in making non-woven textiles in the airlaid, meltblown and/or spunbonding process or the invention may be drawn to a fabric used in a dry application such as a belting media (page 4, lines 5-13). The specification does not teach or suggest a belt used in making nonwoven textiles in the airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding process.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36-37 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,432,850 to Takagi in view of USPN 5,744,236 to Rohrbach.

Regarding claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36-37 and 39-40, Takagi discloses a conductive fabric comprising a plurality of polymeric filaments having one or more C-shaped grooves formed therein, wherein each filament includes electrically conductive polymer material incorporated as a coating that substantially fills the C-shaped grooves (see entire document including column 1, lines 6-10, column 3, lines 53-64, column 4, lines 8-21 and Figure 1). Takagi disclose that the conductive fabric has excellent static dissipation properties (column 1, lines 6-11), therefore, the fabric can at least be compared to a metal-based fabric in terms of conductivity. Considering that the fibers have a core comprising synthetic material (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4), the fabric is considered to be resistant to dents and creases.

Takagi does not appear to mention the C-shaped grooves having a mouth with a width less than the central portion of the groove, but Rohrbach clearly discloses that it is known in the multi-lobe polymer fiber art to use C-shaped filaments having a mouth with a width less than the central portion of the groove to entrap material inside the filament for increased durability (see

Art Unit: 1794

entire document including column 1, lines 46-63, column 3, lines 20-27, column 4, lines 5-9, and Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the C-shaped filaments having a mouth with a width less than the central portion of the groove to entrap material, as taught by Rohrbach, because the filaments would have increased durability by partially encasing the material within the polymer filament. The C-shaped configuration taught by Rohrbach inherently allows for continued exposure of the conductive polymer to the filament surface as the monofilament wears so that the filament retains its conductivity (see the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the current specification).

The substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958). When a patent claims a structure already known in the prior art that is altered by the mere substitution of one element for another known in the field, the combination must do more than yield a predictable result. **KSR v. Teleflex**

Regarding the fabric being an industrial belt used in making nonwoven textiles in the airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes, considering the substantially identical fabric taught by the applied prior art, compared to the claimed fabric, it appears that the fabric could be used as claimed. It is noted that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Regarding claim 2, Takagi discloses that the filaments may constitute between thirty and one hundred percent of the fabric (column 3, lines 34-39).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, considering that Takagi disclose that the conductive fabric has excellent static dissipation properties (column 1, lines 6-11) and that the fibers have a core comprising synthetic material (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4), the fabric is considered to have static dissipation properties equivalent to metal-based fabrics while also having physical properties (modulus, tenacity, strength, adhesion, abrasion resistance, and/or durability) comparable to non-conductive synthetic fabrics.

Regarding claims 7-8 and 27-28, Takagi discloses that the filament may have an oriented structure coated with conductive polymer material (column 4, lines 16-21 and Figure 1).

Regarding claims 8 and 28, Takagi discloses that the fibers may be formed by bicomponent spinning, but Takagi does not appear to specifically mention the claimed method of applying conductive polymer. Considering that substantially identical structure illustrated in Figure 1 of Takagi compared to Figure 1 of the current application, it is the examiner's position that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article.

Regarding claims 11-14, 16, 31-34, 36 and 39-40, Takagi discloses that the filament may be lobed monofilament coated with conductive polymer material (see Figure 1).

Regarding claims 12, 32 and 39-40, Takagi discloses that the fabric, and therefore the coating, may have a conductivity of 10^6 to $10^9 \Omega$ (column 5, lines 15-19).

Regarding claims 13-14, 16, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36 and 40, Rohrbach discloses that shape of the one or more C-shaped grooves may run along a length of the monofilament such that a mechanical interlock forms between the monofilament and the conductive polymer filling the grooves such that the interlock reduces a need for adhesion of the conductive polymer to the monofilament (column 1, lines 46-63).

Regarding claims 16 and 36, the C-shaped configuration taught by Rohrbach inherently allows for continued exposure of the conductive polymer to the filament surface as the monofilament wears so that the filament retains its conductivity and the positioning of the conductive polymer in the grooves shields the polymer and reduces the impact of its lesser abrasion resistance and physical properties (see the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the current specification).

Regarding claims 17 and 37, Takagi discloses that the degree of surface area coverage of the conductive fiber is preferably 20 to 70% in consideration of processability, manufacturing costs, and conductivity (column 4, lines 40-51), but Takagi does not specifically mention weight percent of conductive polymer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the weight percent of conductive polymer, such as from 1 to 10%, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the weight percent conductive polymer directly affects processability, manufacturing costs, and conductivity and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 19, Takagi discloses that the fabric may be single-layered or multi-layered (column 6, lines 8-14 and Figure 6).

Regarding claim 20, Takagi discloses that the fabric may comprise weft and warp filaments (woven fabric) (column 3, lines 53-64).

Regarding claim 22, Takagi does not specifically mention the claimed use, but considering the substantially identical fabric taught by Takagi, compared to the claimed fabric, it appears that the fabric disclosed by Takagi could be used as claimed.

6. Claims 9-10, 23, 29-30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,432,850 to Takagi in view of USPN 5,744,236 to Rohrbach as applied to claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36-37 and 39-40 above, and further in view of USPN 4,803,096 to Kuhn.

Regarding claims 9-10, 23, 29-30 and 38, Takagi discloses that the conductive polymer may be mixture of a conductive powder with a polymer melt (column 5, lines 38-50), but Takagi does not specifically mention a polyaniline or polypyrrole. Kuhn discloses that it is known in the antistatic fabric art that conductive polymer fibers comprising a mixture of a conductive powder with a polymer may be substituted with polyaniline or polypyrrole conductive polymers to eliminate disadvantageous such as undesirable alteration of the physical properties of the fibers (see entire document including column 1, lines 6-66). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the conductive polymer material from any suitable conductive polymer material, such as a polyaniline or polypyrrole, to eliminate disadvantageous such as undesirable alteration of the physical properties of the fibers and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability.

Regarding claims 10 and 30, considering that Kuhn discloses that polyanilines and polypyrrole do not alter the physical properties of the fibers, and considering that the fiber taught by the prior art is substantially identical to the claimed fibers, it appears that the fibers would have physical properties comparable to a polyamide filament.

7. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36-37 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,432,850 to Takagi in view of USPN 5,744,236 to Rohrbach in view of any one of USPN 3,842,465 to Sillaots or USPN 5,830,983 to Alex.

Regarding claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36-37 and 39-40, Takagi discloses a conductive fabric comprising a plurality of polymeric filaments having one or more C-shaped grooves formed therein, wherein each filament includes electrically conductive polymer material incorporated as a coating that substantially fills the C-shaped grooves (see entire document including column 1, lines 6-10, column 3, lines 53-64, column 4, lines 8-21 and Figure 1). Takagi disclose that the conductive fabric has excellent static dissipation properties (column 1, lines 6-11), therefore, the fabric can at least be compared to a metal-based fabric in terms of conductivity. Considering that the fibers have a core comprising synthetic material (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4), the fabric is considered to be resistant to dents and creases.

Takagi does not appear to mention the C-shaped grooves having a mouth with a width less than the central portion of the groove, but Rohrbach clearly discloses that it is known in the multi-lobe polymer fiber art to use C-shaped filaments having a mouth with a width less than the central portion of the groove to entrap material inside the filament for increased durability (see entire document including column 1, lines 46-63, column 3, lines 20-27, column 4, lines 5-9, and Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the C-shaped filaments having a mouth with a width less than the central portion of the groove to entrap material, as taught by Rohrbach, because the filaments would have increased durability by partially encasing the material within the polymer filament. The C-shaped configuration taught by Rohrbach inherently allows for continued exposure of the conductive polymer to the filament surface as the monofilament wears so that the filament retains its conductivity (see the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the current specification).

The substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958). When a patent claims a structure already known in the prior art that is altered by the mere substitution of one element for another known in the field, the combination must do more than yield a predictable result. **KSR v. Teleflex.**

Takagi does not appear to mention using the fabric for making a belt, but Sillaots discloses that it is known in the nonwoven making belt art to use antistatic plastic (see entire document including column 1, lines 6-29) and Alex discloses that it is known in the belt art, including conveyor belt art, to use antistatic material (see entire document including column 1, lines 19-40). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the conductive fabric to make a belt, because the belt would advantageously possess an antistatic property.

Regarding claim 2, Takagi discloses that the filaments may constitute between thirty and one hundred percent of the fabric (column 3, lines 34-39).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, considering that Takagi discloses that the conductive fabric has excellent static dissipation properties (column 1, lines 6-11) and that the fibers have a core comprising synthetic material (paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4), the fabric is considered to have static dissipation properties equivalent to metal-based fabrics while also having physical properties (modulus, tenacity, strength, adhesion, abrasion resistance, and/or durability) comparable to non-conductive synthetic fabrics.

Regarding claims 7-8 and 27-28, Takagi discloses that the filament may have an oriented structure coated with conductive polymer material (column 4, lines 16-21 and Figure 1).

Regarding claims 8 and 28, Takagi discloses that the fibers may be formed by bicomponent spinning, but Takagi does not appear to specifically mention the claimed method of applying conductive polymer. Considering that substantially identical structure illustrated in Figure 1 of Takagi compared to Figure 1 of the current application, it is the examiner's position

that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article.

Regarding claims 11-14, 16, 31-34, 36 and 39-40, Takagi discloses that the filament may be lobed monofilament coated with conductive polymer material (see Figure 1).

Regarding claims 12, 32 and 39-40, Takagi discloses that the fabric, and therefore the coating, may have a conductivity of 10^6 to $10^9 \Omega$ (column 5, lines 15-19).

Regarding claims 13-14, 16, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36 and 40, Rohrbach discloses that shape of the one or more C-shaped grooves may run along a length of the monofilament such that a mechanical interlock forms between the monofilament and the conductive polymer filling the grooves such that the interlock reduces a need for adhesion of the conductive polymer to the monofilament (column 1, lines 46-63).

Regarding claims 16 and 36, the C-shaped configuration taught by Rohrbach inherently allows for continued exposure of the conductive polymer to the filament surface as the monofilament wears so that the filament retains its conductivity and the positioning of the conductive polymer in the grooves shields the polymer and reduces the impact of its lesser abrasion resistance and physical properties (see the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the current specification).

Regarding claims 17 and 37, Takagi discloses that the degree of surface area coverage of the conductive fiber is preferably 20 to 70% in consideration of processability, manufacturing costs, and conductivity (column 4, lines 40-51), but Takagi does not specifically mention weight percent of conductive polymer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the weight percent of conductive polymer, such as from 1 to 10%, because it is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art that the weight percent conductive polymer directly affects processability, manufacturing costs, and conductivity and because it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 19, Takagi discloses that the fabric may be single-layered or multi-layered (column 6, lines 8-14 and Figure 6).

Regarding claim 20, Takagi discloses that the fabric may comprise weft and warp filaments (woven fabric) (column 3, lines 53-64).

Regarding claim 22, Takagi does not specifically mention the claimed use, but considering the substantially identical fabric taught by Takagi, compared to the claimed fabric, it appears that the fabric disclosed by Takagi could be used as claimed.

Art Unit: 1794

8. Claims 9-10, 23, 29-30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,432,850 to Takagi in view of USPN 5,744,236 to Rohrbach in view of any one of USPN 3,842,465 to Sillaots or USPN 5,830,983 to Alex as applied to claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27-28, 31-34, 36-37 and 39-40 above, and further in view of USPN 4,803,096 to Kuhn.

Regarding claims 9-10, 23, 29-30 and 38, Takagi discloses that the conductive polymer may be mixture of a conductive powder with a polymer melt (column 5, lines 38-50), but Takagi does not specifically mention a polyaniline or polypyrrole. Kuhn discloses that it is known in the antistatic fabric art that conductive polymer fibers comprising a mixture of a conductive powder with a polymer may be substituted with polyaniline or polypyrrole conductive polymers to eliminate disadvantageous such as undesirable alteration of the physical properties of the fibers (see entire document including column 1, lines 6-66). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the conductive polymer material from any suitable conductive polymer material, such as a polyaniline or polypyrrole, to eliminate disadvantageous such as undesirable alteration of the physical properties of the fibers and because it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability.

Regarding claims 10 and 30, considering that Kuhn discloses that polyanilines and polypyrrole do not alter the physical properties of the fibers, and considering that the fiber taught by the prior art is substantially identical to the claimed fibers, it appears that the fibers would have physical properties comparable to a polyamide filament.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 4/25/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts that the fabric disclosed by Takagi is not capable of being used in making nonwoven textiles in the airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding process, because Takagi relates to garment fabrics with fibers having a denier of 10 to 200 denier and because said fabrics are allegedly not suitable to withstand the pressure and load experienced by fabrics used in said processes. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Firstly, the applicant has failed to show that a fabric comprising fibers having a denier of 10 to 200 denier is incapable of being used as claimed. The applicant asserts that Exhibit I, filed 4/25/2008, demonstrates that industrial belts "typically" use yarns having a larger diameter and that Exhibit II, filed 4/25/2008, demonstrates that industrial belts "typically" use yarns with linear density of around 2444 denier or higher. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Firstly, it is not clear that Exhibit I is drawn to an industrial belt. Secondly, the Exhibits appear to be drawn to articles consisting of specific materials (Exhibit I only refers to PET while Exhibit II only refers to polyester and nylon) rather than drawn to the broad range of materials covered by the current claims. Therefore, it is not clear that all materials would require said diameter or linear density. Thirdly, the evidence clearly fails to support the notion that all industrial fabric fibers must have a denier of greater than 200 denier. Even though the fabrics of the Exhibits appear to utilize larger denier fibers, this showing falls well short of demonstrating that all industrial belts require said fiber denier.

The applicant asserts that the applied prior art does not teach the claimed fabric structure because Sillaots is directed to an apparatus used in a carding process, rather than an airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding process. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Considering the substantially identical fabric taught by the applied prior art, compared to the claimed fabric, it appears that the fabric could be used as claimed. The current claims state that the fabric is "used in making nonwoven textiles in the airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes." A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

The applicant asserts that the claimed industrial belt used in an airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding process must be permeable to liquids to function. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly, the current specification does not even mention a belt used in a wet application. To the contrary, the specification only mentions a belt used in a dry application. Therefore, the specification teaches that at least some industrial belt fabrics are not permeable.

The applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine Takagi with Sillaots. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Takagi does not appear to mention using the fabric for making nonwoven textiles, but Sillaots discloses that it is known in the nonwoven making belt art to use antistatic plastic (see entire document including column 1, lines 6-29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the conductive fabric to make nonwoven textiles, because the fabric possesses antistatic properties that are desirable in the art.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated any new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew T Piziali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794